

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 09/591,927	Applicant(s) MIURA ET AL.	
	Examiner Christopher A. Revak	Art Unit 2131	

All Participants:

(1) Christopher A. Revak.

(2) George Yee.
Status of Application: RCE

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 10 May 2005
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

all

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet
Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 5/10/05

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted the applicant's representative in an attempt to compact prosecution. Upon review of the applicant's amendments and specification, the examiner noted a feature that was disclosed, but not claimed by the applicant. The examiner described known prior art techniques whereby licensed software requires a license key to be entered upon first use of the content and this information is encrypted and then sent to a vendor or third party so that it can be confirmed to authorize use of the software. The applicant's invention differs in the fact that this information is done through an automated process without requiring the user to enter this information and although the encryption key and access number are transmitted to the user, it is not visible. The applicant agreed to amend the claims to distinguish from the prior art in order to allow the application to be issued as allowable.